

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

8 BARRY BROWN, JENNIFER BROWN,) Case No. 13-1451 SC
9 JANE DOE 1, and JANE DOE 2,)
10 Plaintiffs,) ORDER GRANTING IN PART AND
11 v.) DENYING IN PART MOTIONS TO
12 JON ALEXANDER, DEAN WILSON ED) SEAL
13 FLESHMAN, JULIE CAIN, CINDY)
14 SALATNAY, COUNTY OF DEL NORTE,)
and DONALD CROCKET,)
15 Defendants.)
16

17 Defendants Jon Alexander, Dean Wilson, Ed Fleshman, Julie
18 Cain, Cindy Salatnay, and the County of Del Norte (collectively,
19 the "County Defendants") now move for an order permitting them to
20 file under seal: (1) their motion to dismiss, (2) their request for
21 judicial notice and attached exhibits, and (3) the Declaration of
22 William F. Mitchell re: Submission of State Court Protective
23 Orders. ECF No. 23 ("Cnty's Mot."). Also before the Court is a
24 similar motion by Defendant Donald Crocket ("Crocket") for
25 permission to file under seal: (1) his motion to dismiss, (2) his
26 request for judicial notice, and (3) the declaration of Dohn R.
27 Henion. ECF No. 21 ("Crocket Mot."). Crocket also requests that
28 the Court issue an order sealing the entire case.

1 The County's Motion is GRANTED in part and DENIED in part, as
2 is Crocket's. The parties may file under seal their request for
3 judicial notice and declarations, as well as the documents attached
4 thereto. However, the parties' request to file under seal their
5 motions to dismiss is DENIED without prejudice. Pursuant to Civil
6 Local Rule 79-5(a), sealing requests must be narrowly tailored, and
7 not all information contained in the parties' motions is privileged
8 or otherwise entitled to protection. The County Defendants and
9 Crocket may re-file their administrative motions pursuant to Civil
10 Local Rule 79-5(c), which governs requests to file portions of
11 documents under seal. The administrative motions should propose
12 redactions to the parties' respective motions to dismiss and
13 specifically explain why those redactions are necessary.

14 Crocket's request to seal the entire case is also DENIED.
15 Crocket has offered no authority that would support such a drastic
16 remedy. Nor has he enunciated compelling reasons for sealing the
17 entire case. His request is conclusory and does not address the
18 fact that almost all of the docket entries in this matter,
19 including the Complaint, have been available to the public since
20 the case was filed in April 2013.

22 IT IS SO ORDERED.

24 Dated: August 15, 2013

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE